

REMARKS:

In the Office Action mailed on August 24, 2004, the Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing every feature on the invention specified in the claims, objected to claims 1, 6, 7 and 8 using an improper antecedent reference, rejected claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishikawa 6,530,786, and indicated that claims 3 - 5 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With this amendment the drawings have been changed, the specification has been modified, claim 3 has been canceled, and claims 1 and 4 - 8 have been amended. Claims 1, 2 and 4 - 8 remain in this application.

Figures 5 and 6 were changed to show the thin seal layer 255 described in the specification. Attached is a copy of sheet of drawings marked "Replacement Sheet" showing the addition of the thin seal layer. The specification was changed to indicate the slot having walls with an "inwardly directed C-shaped cross section" rather than the slot having an "inwardly ladder shape", to add reference numeral 255 to the thin seal layer, and to indicate that the terminal protection device is "held" by the plate rather than being "locked" by it. Since the basis for the objections regarding the slot being inwardly ladder shaped and the terminal protection device being covered by a thin seal layer, have been removed, the objections to the drawings and claims regarding these two items should be overcome.

The Examiner is thanked for her consideration in indicating that claims 3 - 5 and 8 would be allowable. At the Examiner's suggestion claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of allowable claim 3 in addition to the terminal protection device being "held" by the plate rather than being "locked" to it and the slot having a wall with an "inwardly directed C-shaped cross section" rather than the slot having an "inwardly ladder shape". The "locked" and "ladder shape" were terms in the translation of the first filed Chinese application and the applicant's attorney did not correct these errors which are obvious from the drawings. Accordingly, claim 1 should now be allowable.

Since claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1 then claim 2 should also be allowable.

Claims 4 and 5 were amended to depend upon claim 1. Since they now depend from

allowable claim 1, they should also be allowable.


Claims 6 and 7 were amended to refer to "a" surface of the terminal protection device rather than "the" surface correcting for an improper use of an antecedent reference. Since these two claims depend from allowable claim 1, they should also be allowable.

Claim 8 as suggested by the examiner was amended to include the limitation of base claim 1 in addition to the terminal protection device being "held" by the plate rather than being "locked" to it and referring to "a" surface of the terminal protection device rather than "the" surface. Accordingly, claim 8 should now be allowable.

The Applicant believes that the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner have been overcome. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the changes to the drawings and the specification and to allow all of the claims remaining in the application to grant into a patent.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: Sept 3, 2004

By:   
Stephen Z. Weiss  
Registration No. 28,486  
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:  
Stephen Z. Weiss  
MOLEX INCORPORATED  
2222 Wellington Court  
Lisle, Illinois 60532  
Tel.: (630) 527-4430  
Fax.: (630) 416-4962